

~~SECRET~~

. . . . The 44th meeting of the CIA RETIREMENT BOARD  
convened at 2:10 p.m. on Tuesday, 27 September 1966, with the following  
present:

Mr. Emmett D. Echols, Chairman

25X1A9a

Mr. Alan M. Warfield, DDS Member

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: As our first order of business I'd like to  
call your attention to paragraphs 2.d. and 3.b. of the Minutes of our last  
meeting (43rd Meeting - 13 September 1966). Is paragraph 2.d. the  
consensus of our meeting on the 13th of September?

25X1A9a

24 days, did it?

I guess that really didn't come out 34 months and

25X1A9a

But what I did in the calculation--

I see how it was arrived at, but that is arithmetic--

We took the verified -- that which could be

verified, and then took the remainder up to 60--

25X1A9a

Which indicated a minimum of -- and it looks  
a little too stacked.

MR. ECHOLS: Yes --

25X1A9a

Well, in the last part of that paragraph there,

Emmett - "In accepting the above period of domestic qualifying service..." -  
it seems to me that the thought there really is that not all of which constituted  
domestic qualifying service.

MR. ECHOLS: Doesn't that come through loud and clear in  
the second sentence there - "... should not suggest a precedent that all of the  
duties ... were considered as qualifying" -- the subsequent sentence there.

~~SECRET~~

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

SECRET

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes. If you read the first sentence alone, however, it says that we didn't consider that to be qualifying service but we did consider some of it to be --

MR. ECHOLS: We did accept a period of domestic service -- we accepted part of that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Maybe we should spell out - "...the above period of 34 months and--

MR. ECHOLS: "... in accepting above minimum period..." -- be consistent with what we said before --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "...of qualifying service..."

MR. WARFIELD: Why don't you delete that whole phrase - "...the Board noted that the over-all period of domestic service" etc.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't even like the parenthetical one too much. I wonder what that adds? I'm thinking in terms of a different group of people looking back at what we, in all our wisdom, did here. "he had been directly operationally involved in significant Clandestine Services' operations..." -- this could apply to an awful lot of people. I don't think in itself it's meaningful.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But this is pertaining here to a case -- this is not meant to be applied to any other case.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'm just wondering if we're not saying more than we have to here.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The idea, really, in the second one there - the involvement--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The second one I think is the more pertinent one. As a matter of fact, I don't see much distinction between (1) and (2).

MR. ECHOLS: Doesn't (1) establish the fact that he has indeed been engaged in the support of foreign intelligence operations or intelligence operations abroad?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think it should say that - "abroad" should be in there somewhere.

SECRET

**SECRET**

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You have all the thoughts in the second one,  
Emmett, that you have in the first one, really.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "... support of Clandestine Services' operations  
abroad" --

MR. WARFIELD: We aren't supposed to have any domestic  
operations abroad.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think we are all concerned -- this is pretty  
key in establishing any precedent--

MR. WARFIELD: I don't think it is at all, Harry. I think  
you have already made clear you're not establishing a precedent, you're talking  
about an individual case -- you're taking that case and adjudicating that case. If  
the thing has any shortcomings it is that it doesn't establish any precedent --  
which I agree with, at this point --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It doesn't except as any common law establishes  
a precedent. In other words, you can't just say, "Oh yes, he is the same as

25X1A9a [REDACTED] -- but you do say, "Let's see some other cases" -- I mean, inevitably  
you must refer back to decisions that were made, to see whether it fits.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Under (11)(b) (referring to HR 20-50c) it  
says: "under conditions of employment requiring the continuing practice of most  
stringent security and covert tradecraft procedures to maintain personal cover  
in the conduct or support of covert action operations or espionage and counter-  
intelligence activities abroad."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "Abroad" is in there.  
[REDACTED]: That is the one under which he was--  
[REDACTED] Yes, but when we considered the case then if he  
was in custody of a defector - picked up the defector abroad and brought him  
to this country, we were quite willing to include his time in this country as  
part of that--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But it was in support of activities abroad--  
[REDACTED] Well, if the "abroad" is meant only to indicate

**SECRET**

SECRET

that the principal activity is abroad, I guess that is right.

MR. ECHOLS: The Regulation used the terminology "support of covert action operations abroad" --

MR. WARFIELD: Except that really isn't true, because when a defector defects that operation is terminated --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It seems to me that the care of these people until their final disposition, whether here or abroad, is in support of activities abroad. The defection was abroad.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Phil, maybe I'm missing your point. Supposing under paragraph d. (2) you said that he had acted in direct contact with a large number of very distinctly Clandestine Services' operational cases over a period covering many years -- what does paragraph (1) accomplish, then? All I've added was the Clandestine Services --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'll admit they are somewhat close - a little

25X1A9a redundant, yet I remember [REDACTED] made a significant point in bringing out the [REDACTED] operational aspect -- and these are practically his words.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But "operations" is a pretty general term. We are kind of zeroing in on the fact it was his handling of defectors that built up the greatest portion of his time in this case.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "Operations" is not necessarily covert activities.

MR. ECHOLS: In (1), (2), and (3) aren't we just merely trying to point out in general terms how this man's career in regard to 60 months of service generally fits in with the criteria of the Regulation -- and we say this is a case - we are talking about this case. It's sort of a rough summarization of some of the key things we observed about his career during this period. I wonder if we need nit-pick this as to precise language?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Maybe just insert "abroad" after "operational cases", in paragraph (2), and let it go at that.

MR. ECHOLS: Were they all abroad?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Each of these defector cases, certainly -- picked him up abroad and escorted him back here.

SECRET



**SECRET**

regulation. But I think what you (indicating Mr. Echols) just said - that we have reviewed this case and, in our view, he has sufficient qualifying service--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, just drop (1), (2), and (3), and put it that he qualified--

MR. ECHOLS: I would personally recommend that we drop (1), (2) and (3) but put a sentence after the initial sentence stating, "The Board

25X1A9a concluded that [REDACTED] performed sufficient periods of service meeting the criteria--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] In (11)(b).

MR. ECHOLS: Refer to (11)(b)?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] (11)(b) is what we're doing it on, and therefore it has to meet that criteria.

Now, your logistics people (indicating Mr. Warfield) wouldn't - necessarily -- because (11)(b) talks about tradecraft procedures and cover, and stringent security requirements -- this is part of (11)(b) -- it isn't merely in support of operations abroad.

MR. ECHOLS: Right.

Is that agreeable, then? "The Board concluded that

25X1A9a [REDACTED] had served 60 or more months of qualifying duty in accordance with the standards of paragraph (11)(b)." And strike out (1), (2), and (3) here. (The Board members indicated they all agreed to this change in the Minutes.)

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I agree. I think we're sticking our necks out with this other.

MR. ECHOLS: Now, how about the last two sentences of that paragraph: "In accepting the above period of domestic qualifying service, the Board noted that the over-all period of domestic service as claimed by [REDACTED] 25X1A9a contained a variety of types of duty the nature of which did not constitute domestic qualifying service. It was the consensus of the Board that the Office of Security should be advised that this particular case should not suggest a precedent that all 25X1A9a of the duties performed by [REDACTED] were considered as qualifying."

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

MR. WARFIELD: I think that can stand saying.

MR. ECHOLS: Then if that is agreeable, we will leave that in.

I would also ask you to look at paragraphs 3.a. and 3.b. here, and whereas a. is perfectly consistent with previous determinations of the Board, I don't quite understand the purpose of b., or what it purports to say.

25X1A9a

██████████ Didn't we get a re-write of this?

No -- this is the same--

MR. ECHOLS: Is the meaning of b. intended to be different than a. ?

25X1A9a

██████████ Yes -- they need not necessarily to have

completed 15 years of service prior to enactment of the Act.

25X1A9a

██████████ I don't it's clearly stated - "who had been in a

posture in which they were available..." I go back to the case I had

25X1A9a (referring to case of ██████████ of an individual who had been in such a posture but is not now, because of her own initiative.

MR. ECHOLS: Would this be a better interpretation: "As a practical interpretation of the Regulation, Agency employees who had already completed 60 months of qualifying duty and who maintain a posture that they are available for overseas service could be admitted to the System regardless of whether or not they were then 'serving on a career basis in a field which normally requires the performance of qualifying service as an integral part of a career in that field.'"

25X1A9a

██████████ That changes the meaning.

██████████: What does the "then" refer to? Do you mean at the time you're considering his case for designation?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes.

25X1A9a

██████████ I think we ought to put that in there -- because

I made a note here "please illustrate this case" -- because this bothers me.

25X1A9a Didn't we discuss this in terms of ██████████ case last time, but that person had over 14 years and had 60 months--

**SECRET**

SECRET

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I checked on that, and that person has 12 years and about two or three months, and has 60 months and 12 days of qualifying service, signed the overseas agreement in January, but in April, at her own request, was transferred out of our Career Service into NPIC on the basis of being unwilling to travel and serve overseas again, and sought this new job for that specific reason.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] But then we also discussed the fact she hadn't been told the consequences of her doing this--

[REDACTED] She WAS told--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] But at the time we discussed it--

[REDACTED] She was told, and she said this was all right with her.

MR. WARFIELD: Then she in effect--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] In April, 1966.

MR. ECHOLS: She in effect opted out.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'm sorry, but I'm lost here. We are trying to make a distinction, then, between people who have had 15 years of service and five overseas -- we are saying now they may be in any Career Service and we're perfectly willing to bring them in?

MR. ECHOLS: If they had these qualifications at the time of the enactment of the Act or at the time of the initial review. Right?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] But a. doesn't say that. I'd say a. says that if somebody had 15 or more years of service, five of which were overseas, and they were now in the DDI, and had been for the past five years, that they still could be brought in--

MR. ECHOLS: It specifically says "at the time of enactment of the Act, or at the time of initial review". In other words, they were fully qualified either at the time of enactment of the Act or at the time of the initial review.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] They were qualified except for one thing - they

SECRET



**SECRET**

were not then serving on a career basis in a field which normally requires--

We've made an exception.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think if we modified paragraph b. a little bit along the lines you just said, Emmett -- because this word "available" is, to me, the key word -- if they are available -- which to me means that regardless of what Career Service they're in, if they were ordered overseas they would go -- which distinguishes from those who are unwilling to go overseas and would refuse if ordered to go.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I'm not clear what we are trying to say. I know what we are trying to say in a., but in b. we're saying if you haven't done your 15 years yet then we're not going to approach this in the same way. In other words, this sounds to me like b. is now amplifying a. a little bit and saying even if you don't have 15 years, if you have done five years of qualifying service you may also be brought into the act even if you're no longer in a career field that normally requires--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think this was reflected in [REDACTED] 25X1A9a thinking -- as long as they maintain a posture--

MR. ECHOLS: As long as they maintain a posture of availability.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] And I don't think it should say "who had been in" a posture, because anybody who has been overseas at all has been in a posture of availability, but are not necessarily so now.

MR. WARFIELD: Couldn't we break this down and talk about the individual who was in the appropriate posture at the time of the enactment of the Bill, and who had 15 years, and five qualifying, that regardless of where he was when the Board got around to looking at his name, he was in -- if at the initial review he had 15 years, five of which were qualifying, he was in -- regardless of his posture at that moment. But if his posture at the time of enactment of the Act was okay -- or is that right? or is it -- did he have to be available at the time of the initial review?

**SECRET**

SECRET

25X1A9a [REDACTED] They changed that -- actually, on January 4th they said at the time of passage of the Act, and then on January 18th - two weeks later - they said either at the time of the enactment of the Act or at the time of the initial review if he has had 15 years and the five months -- that it doesn't make any difference, that in either case--

MR. WARFIELD: Right. And from there on--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And from there on, then you have to follow the Regulation. That was the only (gift) we were giving an individual, and we felt that it was all right to do so in that case because we wanted to give him the benefit of the right to make an election which otherwise would have been taken away from him -- and it was the only case where we were making an exception - that it didn't make any difference whether he was then serving on a career basis providing that he had the 15 years and the five months either at the time of the passage of the Act or at the time of the first, initial go-around.

25X1A9a MR. WARFIELD: Now, to get back to Roger's case (referring -03092A000300060001-9

25X1A9a to the case of [REDACTED], if she had waited until she had completed her 15 years and then had come back and said, "I now want to transfer to NPIC, and I want to tear up my overseas agreement" she could still have been a participant for the rest of her life.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I would have said so, yes.

MR. WARFIELD: As soon as she had finished her 15 years--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'd like to push this one step further. I have a couple of people who have had five or six years of overseas service and on the basis of that are in the System, but there are a couple of them that I know of that have said, "I've had it -- no more overseas for me -- my wife had a nervous breakdown" or you name it. Now when it gets around to their 15th year are we going to allow them to stay in the System?

MR. WARFIELD: You have no alternative.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, you do -- you have a review six months prior--

SECRET

**SECRET**

MR. WARFIELD: But I think the burden of proof would be on

you --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] If they had the 60 months under their belt,

they were in -- I thought that was the general thing--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You see, the difference between the cases

25X1A9a you cite (indicating Mr. Warfield) and [REDACTED] case is that this girl did not have her 15 years -- she had her 60 months but she did not have her 15 years at the time of the passage of the Act or at the time of the first go-around -- so at that point the only thing we can consider is whether she should be admitted to the System. Now if at the time we consider her for admission into the System she says, "I don't want any part of this System" --

MR. WARFIELD: I'm saying if she had not said that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] If she had not said that we would have had to bring her in as a participant.

Now then, at the time of the election at the time of the 15 years, she still has to be a member of a Career Service, as I see it, where she is performing qualifying service, at the time she makes her election -- because she doesn't fall within that excepted case -- the one exception we made required one of two things: 15 years at the time of passage of the Act or at the time of first election, plus five years of qualifying service. The only thing that was available to this girl was admission to this System as a designee - could she be designated? Now if at the point that she is to be designated -- and she doesn't have anything else available to her -- she says, "No, I don't want any part of this System", then she fails to meet the requirements for designation as a participant.

MR. WARFIELD: All I'm saying is had she not made such a statement--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Had she not made this statement she would be automatically admitted as a participant in this System.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

25X1A9a . . . . [REDACTED] joined the meeting at this point . . . .

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Wasn't this Jim's point?

MR. ECHOLS: We're having trouble, Jim, with what we are trying to say here with paragraph 3.b. of the Minutes of our last meeting.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, I think my question is whether she knew she was making this election at that point, or not.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, she knew. Let me read a little from a Memorandum of Conversation with her -- and this is her Division Chief speaking:

25X1A9a [REDACTED] advised me that her reasons for transferring to NPIC are indeed to avoid further overseas service. She stated she was somewhat in doubt about signing her statement of intentions in January, but did so with an open mind since the matter of future overseas service had not been made totally clear. She indicated that she will not be greatly disappointed if she is not included in the CIAR, and does not wish to change her plans for assignment to NPIC. She asked me whether she might be included in the CIAR system at some future date [REDACTED] if she changes her mind about overseas duty and [REDACTED] transfers to a component requiring overseas service. I stated this is certainly possible and that her overseas service with [REDACTED] will remain on her record as qualifying service." FOIAb3b1

So she hasn't said she wants nothing to do with the CIA System, she says she wants nothing to do with overseas service.

And in another conversation: "Her impending removal from a career field which normally requires the performance of qualifying service to one that does not is at her own initiative for the specific purpose of avoiding such service in the future."

She hasn't had the 15 years. I would think this paragraph 3.b. if we didn't have it read "...who had been in a posture" -- because she has been in such a posture. I think we should say, "...who is in a posture" --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Mr. Echols suggested we say, "...and who maintain a posture" --

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is such an obvious statement you wonder why you would have to write a paragraph on it. Certainly anyone who has five years of qualifying service, and is in a career field, without question is eligible. Why do we make a point of it?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The thing that makes this important, I think, is whether or not a person who has served five years -- let's say he has only been around for seven years but he has served five overseas, and at the time he comes up for admission into the System we take a look at his case and we find he is over in the DDI now and he's not serving in a Career Service that normally calls for that, and the question is whether he should be kept out of this System. saying - This is [REDACTED] no, he shouldn't -- as long as he has kept himself available for doing overseas duty at any time, the fact that he is in a sister service that normally doesn't send people overseas should not disqualify him from being a participant in the System.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] You have one very good example of that in a case here today - [REDACTED] He had been with the Clandestine Services, had performed his 60 months while in the Western Hemisphere Division, and has since moved over to the [REDACTED] DDI side of the house where he has performed no overseas service -- but nevertheless, the Head of his Career Service nominated him for the System.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] The reason that becomes important is the criteria for designation as a participant in the Regulation, because that specifically provides they had to be serving on a career basis in a field which normally requires-- Now, this deviates from that slightly, so that if we are going to adopt this, then, as I see it, the next time we revise this - we are going to have to revise this in some way. Now, do we have the right--

MR. WARFIELD: I thought we agreed at an earlier meeting that we would take a liberal attitude toward that as long as the individual certified and signed the agreement and was available for dispatching anywhere--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But can we use that interpretation without

**SECRET**

going back and correcting this--

MR. WARFIELD: I hold no brief for the Regulation or the law itself, the way it's written, but I think we did agree to that interpretation.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Mike, I don't think there is a single component that at some time or other might not require a person to serve overseas, if only on a TDY -- that is true of the DD/I --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I was thinking in terms of earlier discussions we had on this, that the Head of the Career Service would be in a position to know which elements of his Service require overseas service from time to time, and when he certified that a person belonged to one of those elements -- we discussed a number of them, even in the case of the Personnel Office, and if he certifies that this person belongs to an element within the Office of Personnel that normally does this type of thing overseas, we would accept the Head of the Career Service's statement that that person is serving in an element that normally does qualifying service.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But I think at our last meeting we went beyond that. [REDACTED]: That is what we are trying to resolve here. I thought we were talking at the last meeting about the case that [REDACTED] raised -- 25X1A9a and I think the whole point of that case was - as you pointed out - did she know at that time that she was giving up some possible benefit by virtue of the--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] She hadn't been designated, so she wasn't making the same decision as the rest of the people on the list--

MR. WARFIELD: If you want to take a very strict reading of that Regulation -- take for example the Office of Computer Services -- you say - Boy! if you're in the Office of Computer Services you know you're going to stay right here. But now there's a strong likelihood that they're going to have computer services in Vietnam, and these people are going -- you will be able to separate the sheep from the goats, because they won't all sign service agreements--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't find any trouble with that case if they have service in Vietnam--

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

MR. WARFIELD: But that is not a Career Service that normally, at this juncture, would ever expect to be serving overseas--

MR. ECHOLS: Nor is that a career field that normally requires--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, I think we ought to define now what we're talking about here.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think we started out by not liking the statement in paragraph b., or not understanding what it is supposed to be accomplishing -- I guess this is how it started -- Eck wanted to change b. because b. makes it sound as if someone who has had five years' service could be designated a participant even if they are now in a Career Service--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think they can. I thought we agreed to that a long time ago.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] My point goes further than that. This individual I'm talking about is now, at her own request and for the specific reason of avoiding further overseas service, in a Career Service which does not require such qualifying service -- and she does not have 15 years -- but as b. is now phrased it would cover her because she "has been" in a posture--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'm trying to stay with b., but you, Eck, I thought were changing it to say "must now be in a posture", and I was saying that would then change the whole meaning of this thing. Which is it that we're trying to accomplish?

MR. ECHOLS: I think we are trying to not close the door on people who by reason of their current assignment may not be in what we call a Career Service, or in a career field, in the precise sense, which would normally send them overseas again. Who knows what their next assignment is going to be?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Wasn't your suggested change the other way?

MR. ECHOLS: I thought b. was intended to leave the door open for these people as long as they maintained availability for overseas service--

MR. WARFIELD: That is why I don't think [REDACTED] case is 25X1A9a really germane, because she had said, "I am not available" --

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

MR. ECHOLS: And at this time she has no intention of making herself available. I'd scrub her out.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And we can reconsider her case--

MR. ECHOLS: To emphasize a point I'll take a case off the top of my head. I think [REDACTED] has about 11 or maybe 12 years of service, and I'm quite positive he has had more than 60 months overseas. He's serving now up in PPB -- and that may be his career indefinitely, for all I know -- but PPB by and large does not have occasion to send people abroad -- it's not even a field of work that requires people to go overseas -- but I would bet you my bottom dollar that that guy is not going to be in that work indefinitely -- and we all expect, and know this -- and I'm sure he has made himself continuously available. And by reason of this particular assignment -- after his accident over in [REDACTED] - 25X1A6a I don't think if we were considering his case right now we would say, "No, you can't go into the System."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think this b. is fine.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, it's all in the past tense. I think they must maintain a posture of availability--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I thought we had at one time decided that if an individual had five years of overseas service he has thereby demonstrated a kind of attitude that you presume continues for the rest of his service - he has demonstrated that availability or willingness, and that as a practical matter you admit him to the System.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The assignment of the moment doesn't disbar him.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No. I'm sure that we have lots of people in the Clandestine Services who have completed five years and although they've signed the Service Agreement they really have pretty well made up their mind that they don't want to go again, for one reason or another -- and this issue will never arise unless that individual is asked to go abroad. But in the absence of that -- everyone is innocent until proven guilty is the principle that I think is reflected here -- it is assumed that anyone will go overseas again after



**SECRET**

they have done it for five years, unless there is evidence to the contrary.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't think that covers this specific case in which the individual has said that she does not want to go overseas and has sought and has succeeded in getting a job which will not require her to go overseas again. She has removed herself by her own volition.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] (laughing) : She should have taken the 5th a little earlier.

MR. ECHOLS: Is that not positive evidence, then, to the contrary?

MR. WARFIELD: Yes, I think that is positive evidence to the contrary.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I feel the same way, that if a man does five years he should be in, but what do we do about this Regulation as written, and how do we beat the 15 year review? At the 15th year review we're supposed to say: is now engaged in a Career Service which requires overseas' service. Suppose the fellow is now working in the Credit Union?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That's all right, that is a Career Service in which it may be expected he will go overseas if he had done it for five years before.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: All right, except we're putting a new interpretation on the wording in that statement. I'm only saying I think we have a little obstacle in our way. It's very easy, I agree, for someone who is in Commo or the Clandestine Services, to say he's in a Career Service --

MR. ECHOLS: Should we perhaps get a legal opinion and/or a policy agreement that we can so interpret the Regulation?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I thought this WAS [REDACTED] opinion. 25X1A9a

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I thought [REDACTED] sat here one time 25X1A9a and said it was absolutely clear that is the way it reads.

MR. ECHOLS: He did.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think, Eck, this discussion indicates that when

**SECRET**

SECRET

we get around to reviewing this Regulation we also want to review that Form -- because I don't think that statement on the front of the Form is particularly relevant.

MR. ECHOLS: The question I raise is can we deviate this far from the written word in the normal interpretation--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I don't think we can -- or the Regulation. Well, the Regulation can be changed. [REDACTED]: But we can't deviate until after we get it changed. I don't think we can deviate from that. This requires that before designation as a participant he must sign a written obligation to serve anywhere and at any time, according to the needs of the Agency. This doesn't obligate us to subjectively look into whether he intends to go or not. If he signs that agreement, we should accept it. But then "be serving on a career basis" is where I think we're going too far--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: We have never defined it, Mike. [REDACTED]: I don't think it was ever intended that we should have this as a benefit for an individual when we went before Congress --if we said that a man who has been in this Agency six years, five of which he served overseas, and then he comes back and thumbs his nose at us and says, "I will never go overseas again" -- I don't think you would have gotten this--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: That is prima facie evidence-- [REDACTED]: When he says "I won't go overseas again" I would accept that and I would take him out of this System.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Would you object to a formulation that anyone who has five years of qualifying service and has signed the [REDACTED] Service Agreement, regardless of where they are in the Agency, is still considered all right.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Yes, but I still think maybe that would cause us to do some changing of this Regulation.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I think we should avoid trying to draw

SECRET

**SECRET**

the CIA into 29 little boxes -- we would lose all flexibility -- and every time there was a change in the technological fields - and that computer business was a good example - we would have to re-draw our boxes -- and I don't think that was the intent--

MR. ECHOLS: You see, Mike, we used to have a substantial

25X1A6a computer operation in [REDACTED] and a guy might easily have spent 60 months over there in that Service. Then when we abolish that and bring him back here, you would scrub him out?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We have sort of come all the way around. Are you still saying you would like the words added to this which say, "holds himself available", or something of this sort?

MR. ECHOLS: I would change it to state - "who had already completed 60 months of qualifying service and who maintains a posture that he is available for overseas service."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is all right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I would buy that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That's all right.

MR. ECHOLS: Any time he says, "No, I won't go again -- I'm through -- I won't do it -- I withdraw my agreement" - when we have evidence to that effect, then you have a different story.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "...who is available for further overseas service" -- that would simplify it quite a bit.

MR. ECHOLS: But "is available" brings in other factors -- that brings in conditions of health--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] So does "posture" --  
[REDACTED] "...posture in which they are available" --  
[REDACTED] Where is that any different from "is available"?  
[REDACTED] Because if the guy is unavailable for reasons beyond his control -- your words would exclude him, if you flatly say "is available".

MR. WARFIELD: A routine assignment for an economist means

**SECRET**

SECRET

he has to be in pretty good health, but if he happens to have a particular talent in some specific field and you can say this is the only man that can go, they will waive the thing--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But all of this is subject to the approval of the necessary people here - the medicos and so on. The fact is that in the oath you sign all you say is, "Yes, as far as I'm concerned I'm available."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It's the Service Agreement, really--

MR. ECHOLS: Would it be clearer--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, if everybody likes "posture", that's all right with me.

MR. ECHOLS: More specifically is/not <sup>it</sup> "who obligate themselves to serve overseas upon call" ?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is what the Form you sign says.

[REDACTED] It's interesting that at the 15 year review -- and which I realize we are not discussing -- it just sloughs over this by saying it's up to you (indicating Mr. Echols) -- it just says: who has met the provisions, etc., etc., and whose career is adjudged by the Director of Personnel to be qualifying for the System--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But prior to that 15 year review I will go to the Head of the Career Service, for Mr. Echols, and ask for the certification, and this becomes part of the package when Mr. Echols does the judging--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But it is the judgment of the D/Pers.

[REDACTED]: They are talking there about designation of employees at the time of enactment of the Act -- all of this follows under that -- at the time of enactment of the Act.

25X1A9a MR. ECHOLS: That applies to the normal criteria, Harry.

[REDACTED] "...who maintains a posture of availability for further overseas service."

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "...continues to accept the obligation" --

MR. ECHOLS: You could say, "...and who have obligated

**SECRET**

themselves to further overseas service could be admitted to the System" --  
"...have obligated themselves to further overseas service" - would that be  
agreeable?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Sure.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay, let's let it go at that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'd like to raise one more question. Would

25X1A9a you put that to [REDACTED] as to whether or not we need to change the Regulation?

MR. ECHOLS: All right, I'll do that -- I'll ask John specifically  
whether this in his opinion deviates so far from the normal interpretation of the  
Regulation as to require the Director's approval for a change in the Regulation.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Designation of participant--

MR. ECHOLS: And I know what he is going to say.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is, as it relates to this paragraph d., is

that right? - that d. under designation of participants.

MR. ECHOLS: Any other additions or corrections to the  
Minutes of the last meeting? (No response.) If not, we will accept them  
as revised.

Before we go on to the cases, Phil, have you observed any  
complexities or unusual cases here today?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, there is a good number involved in what  
we have been discussing. All of the remaining cases I have been holding, are  
in here today.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Under 15 years--

[REDACTED] It's a combination of those who had 15 years  
and 60 months on 13 October 1964 and those cases who had completed 60 months  
on 13 October 1964. I can indicate those to you as we go along.

MR. ECHOLS: All right, let's take Group A, 27 people, who  
will acquire a vested right if they elect to stay in.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I move we offer them an election, Mr.  
Chairman.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Any unusual cases in this group, Phil?

[REDACTED] This group does include several cases but who had 15 and 60 at the time of enactment of the Act, so no particular problem there.

25X1A9a

Now, would you go to the case of [REDACTED] On

13 October 1964 he had completed his 60 months of verified qualifying service.

He has since completed 15 years. He did not have this combination at that moment in time - at time of enactment of the legislation.

MR. ECHOLS: But at the time of review he had?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Yes, he now has 15 years and 11 months.

He is still in the "A" category here--

What is different from the [REDACTED] case 25X1A9a

is that he has completed 15 years.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] This is the initial review, isn't it? He has

it now?

MR. ECHOLS: This is not in question.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] No problem.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] He is in NPIC also.

Now [REDACTED] career has been similar to the 25X1A9a

25X1A9a one of [REDACTED], the one we've been talking about, except [REDACTED] has 25X1A9a

25X1A9a completed 15 years, [REDACTED] has completed 12, and [REDACTED] transfer to NPIC was 25X1A9a

not for the express purpose, on his part, of avoiding further overseas service.

MR. ECHOLS: And he continues to obligate himself to serve,

and she does not.

25X1A9a

MR. SEELY: Yes, as far as I know -- he's being nominated

by NPIC now.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] His Career Service did ask us to accept his

application for membership in the Career Staff--

MR. ECHOLS: Has he committed himself to further overseas

service?

**SECRET**

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Not in terms of this (discussion) today. But here his Career Service is saying he is in that posture and asking that his application--

MR. ECHOLS: I think we would have to have a signed Service Agreement --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Absolutely.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Effective with our change in the Minutes--  
[REDACTED] Yes, now -- but it wasn't when I prepared this case for submission to the Board.

MR. ECHOLS: Don't all of our cases have the obligation--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Remember on the first go-around we told the Career Services if they wanted to make a statement or to ask us to accept their membership in the Career Staff in lieu of a Service Agreement, it would not be required in every case--

MR. ECHOLS: I thought we would accept an existent, old Service Agreement --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This is what the application for membership in the Career Staff is -- and I have it in writing -- but not the new Form.

MR. ECHOLS: All you are saying is we have not re-verified his obligation?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I just want to be sure I understand you -- you are saying if he is in a Career Service which manifestly is one which requires overseas service, you don't ask anything more, but if he's in one--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I ask for one of two things, either that I receive a newly executed Service Agreement or a certification on the nomination form itself by the Career Service that they also checked the box that - yes, they had reviewed the membership, and it is of record, and asked us to accept that in lieu of a current Service Agreement -- so they have made a judgment at that particular point in time that it is not necessary for the man to sign a new agreement, because they have no reason to doubt this -- so I interpret that to

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

mean this man is serving on a career basis--

MR. ECHOLS: Nonetheless, at the time of the first review --

which is today -- he meets both of these requirements - the 60 months and

15 years -- and I think he would go in on that basis.

25X1A9a

Incidentally, the statement you (indicating

25X1A9a were making doesn't appear on the face of the papers we have--

25X1A9a But it's on the back of that -- it's just not

reproduced here--

25X1A9a

We do have the second sheet here -- but the

block I have checked does correspond with the second side of the page--

25X1A9a

The block which you have checked?

Yes. You see under 7 on our nominee check-list - under 7, where it says Service Agreement? -- I take this from the Form itself, which has been signed off by the Head of the Career Service.

MR. ECHOLS: Does anybody challenge this case? 25X1A9a

MR. WARFIELD: I don't find any trouble with it at all.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay. All of these cases under Group A

have 15 years and their 60 months. I had a motion. Is there a second?

25X1A9a I will second the motion.

. . . . This motion was then passed . . . .

25X1A9a

Do we go ahead on this regardless of what

25X1A9a has to say? I'm sorry -- I want to be with it -- but this still bothers

me -- I still don't understand it - why we are saying we can just discount the statement that says he must currently be serving in a Career Service which requires this. This does not. Then I thought we added - but if he holds himself available, by his statement, that even though he is in a Career Service that does not now normally require it, that he is available--

25X1A9a

We haven't defined a Career

**SECRET**



SECRET

Service "which normally" -- we have avoided that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] So in a sense we're saying anywhere in the Agency.

MR. ECHOLS: We have even avoided using the words "Career Service" because of its compartmentalized significance.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] "Career field" is the term -- that could be all of CIA.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, if that is the interpretation -- and if he said-- Well, okay.

MR. ECHOLS: You know, once we get through this initial review all of these problems are going to disappear --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But you do now - you do have a problem -- if we were ever to go and ask people who have not signed a Service Agreement to do so, we might produce a lot of evidence of unwillingness to go overseas.

MR. ECHOLS: That is right.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And at some point we may want to review the wisdom of our decision here.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Then I think the only problem would be those with under 15 years of service--

MR. ECHOLS: That is right.

In Group B are four persons who will complete 15 years within six months. Now, this does raise a question in my mind -- I don't know how many others we have passed, but in all four cases here under B they have not in fact [REDACTED] completed both the 15 years and the 60 months. Should we put them in before we get a re-ruling on the part of [REDACTED] And 25X1A9a should we not at this time get positive reaffirmation of their continuing obligation to serve?

MR. WARFIELD: They are all overseas right now.

MR. ECHOLS: Oh! I hadn't looked at the details of the cases.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, sir, they are overseas.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay.

SECRET

**SECRET**

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I move these four be designated.

Second.

. . . . This motion was then passed . . . .

MR. ECHOLS: Category C, 40 cases for designation -- they

all have five or more years of Agency service.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Now, if you will go to the third case -

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: What is the problem?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] She has her 60 months -- she had it as of

13 October 1964 -- she has not been out since -- and she is now working in NPIC.

However, I have received a recently executed Service Agreement.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think she qualifies.

[REDACTED]: How can you keep her out!

MR. ECHOLS: No problem.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] This would not be a case, then, that you were

25X1A9a going to ask [REDACTED] for an opinion on -- because she [REDACTED] had her 60

months and is maintaining her posture--

MR. ECHOLS: Next week she may be back in the DD/P, for all

I know.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] She is willing to, in any case.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Yes -- positive evidence of her willingness.

MR. ECHOLS: Positive evidence.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Are you entertaining a motion?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I move that the 40 individuals under

Category C be designated as participants.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I second the motion.

. . . . This motion was then passed . . . .

**SECRET**

MR. ECHOLS: That brings me to one piece of New Business--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Before you go on, could I go back a minute to

25X1A9a the [REDACTED] case? This still bothers me a little. It seems to me we would be much safer if we asked for a new Service Agreement. This case is so parallel to this other case -- many of its superficial characteristics, anyway -- in that they transferred out of a career field that required overseas service and into one which does not, and they have signed nothing new since the early days when they signed their applications for career status -- which was before they transferred -- and it seems to me the record would be stronger in supporting their eligibility if we had new statements signed at this time.

MR. ECHOLS: Any other discussion--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is taking quite a serious step --

that is setting a precedent of some significance -- to ask people at the time they reach their 15 years to again sign an Agreement after they have demonstrated [REDACTED] their general availability with five years overseas. I would think that this is a subject that ought to be taken under study before we apply it [REDACTED] in any case.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, have we not agreed repeatedly, in our Board meetings, that in this first go-around we would not do this very thing?

MR. WARFIELD: Right -- we said we wouldn't on the initial

25X1A9a go-around. And I think [REDACTED] has a good point there, that we ought to think about what are we going to do with the people coming up to their 15 year reviews - for their second reviews -- in the future should we ask them to sign a new Service Agreement, or just let the issue lay?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Is the only exception that is now made to the signing of the new Service Agreement the case of individuals who are not available for some reason and the Head of their Career Service signs the document "in lieu thereof"?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Not in every case, no, sir. I think in our original memo back in April, 1965 we indicated to the Career Services that for

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

those who were definitely overseas we would [REDACTED] accept it, but we left the door open, and I think we said "any other cases" --

MR. ECHOLS: I'm sure we preferred a new Agreement unless it was manifestly patent that the man was willing, was overseas, and had signed the earlier Career Staff application.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We did indicate to the Heads of Career Services we would accept the old application for membership in the Career Staff in lieu of a new Service Agreement. This carried with it the assumption that undoubtedly the Career Service would have reviewed the case and said, in essence, he is serving--

MR. ECHOLS: But how could they speak to the individual's intent? If the man is overseas, I can accept it - his intent is obvious. But if the man is not overseas it would seem to me we ought to require a new statement--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think you indicated at one meeting that you pretty well knew the people in the Personnel Career Service that you could call on as members of your overseas cadre.

MR. WARFIELD: I would think we [REDACTED] ought to be awfully rigid about that. A supervisor knows his people, presumably, and I can think of situations where he might not want to go to a guy and say, "How about signing a new Service Agreement?" If the guy says, "I've been asking to go overseas for the past six months" you raise a subject--

25X1A9a MR. ECHOLS: Didn't you (indicating [REDACTED]) place great stress upon reaffirming--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, when we got into the intent of the individual, I personally thought the Service Agreement was a matter of considerable importance. And it was my impression -- and this is based on pure recollection -- that the exceptions were going to be made for those individuals who were overseas but had signed an old one, that this would be acceptable, in lieu of a new one, until they got back. I would think that everyone in this System as soon as it can be

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

done should sign one of the present Service Agreements.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Wasn't the initial thought that at each review--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't think it was related in any way.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I thought we said at the 10 or 15 year review,  
that that would be an appropriate time for them to reaffirm their willingness--

MR. ECHOLS: Well, we are required, in effect, to see that  
they still meet the criteria at the time of the reviews, are we not?

Well, any further discussion--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Mr. Chairman, I recommend that this  
matter be carefully studied, before the next meeting, by the Director of Personnel  
and the Legal Counsel, together, and we get a view as to whether there is anything  
in the law, or the interpretation of the Regulation, that would affect this -- but  
assuming there is no confusion on this matter, I think that we ought to consider  
the adoption of a very clear rule that the individual does sign a Service Agreement  
if he is going to enter the System.

MR. WARFIELD: I think that is highly desirable, but I can  
think of certain instances where you might not want to bring the individual in  
to discuss this.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We covered this, Alan, in that Bulletin  
we put out for employees -- I believe there was language in there about due  
consideration of personal problems, health and so on. I think this is a very  
gut issue in getting the System started, is to have this obligation signed by people  
in it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But you are talking solely at the point of bringing  
them into the System--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No, I don't think you should renew it  
beyond the 15 year--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I would say we have a high percentage of  
people in the System who have been put in the System on certification by the Head  
of a Career Service that we accept this membership application for the Career

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Staff in lieu of a new Service Agreement. We have a very high percentage, I would say.

MR. ECHOLS: The Regulation is very specific with respect to designation of participants, and it merely requires that they have signed a written obligation to serve anywhere, at any time -- it doesn't say how current that has to be.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This Employee Bulletin (30 July '65) is really quite explicit -- (reading) "A new Service Agreement, Form 3101, is the instrument which the employee must sign in assuming the obligation to perform the 'qualifying service.' For the present the existence in the file of a signed Career Staff form, long in use in the Agency, may be used in lieu of the new form. Form 3101 will be used whenever a new Service Agreement is required."

MR. ECHOLS: We also have a Memorandum dated 21 April 1965 that went out to the Heads of Career Services, Subject: Identification of Employees for Nomination as Participants in the CIA Retirement and Disability System. Paragraph 7 reads as follows:

"An important requirement for participation in the System is the employee's acceptance of a written undertaking obligating him to serve anywhere and at any time according to the Agency's needs. A special Service Agreement has been developed for this purpose and approved by the Board. A supply will be forwarded to your staff as soon as available. However, an employee's previous Application for Membership in the Career Staff of the Central Intelligence Agency may be used in lieu of a newly executed Service Agreement in those cases where the nominee has over 15 years of Agency service, or is not available to sign such an Agreement, or, in your discretion, any other case. In the case of an employee stationed abroad for whom a new Service Agreement is required, you may delay obtaining the Service Agreement until such time as his designation as a participant in the System may have been recommended by the CIA Retirement Board. Your staff will receive prompt notification of such cases; pending receipt of the respective Service Agreements from overseas, such nominations will remain in suspense with the Executive Secretary of the CIA Retirement Board. Section C of Form 3100 should be appropriately marked to show the status of the Service Agreement."

It says, "...may be used in lieu of a newly executed Service Agreement in

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

those cases where the nominee has over 15 years of Agency service, or is not available to sign such an Agreement, or, in your discretion, any other case." I think that "...or...any other case" came up when somebody thought it would be inappropriate to go to some person who was incapacitated, you might say, and ask them [REDACTED] to sign an agreement which, on the face of it, might be anomalous with his capability of doing so. I don't know what else it might be. If he's overseas we use the old agreement, or any other case where [REDACTED] you think it is appropriate to do so.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Was that to the Heads of the Career Services?

MR. ECHOLS: Yes.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] There are many in the System on this basis.

MR. ECHOLS: But I can't remember what made us put that loophole in there.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And it has been widely used?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I wouldn't say widely, but I'd say a good percentage -- where there is evidence in the official file -- and I'll go through the official file, and as soon as the Head of the Career Service asks me to accept that Application for Membership "in lieu of", I make sure it's in the file, and pull it out.

MR. ECHOLS: I suspect the loophole we provided has been used rather extensively.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Maybe I'm missing something, but what is so different about that original form, as far as intent, as opposed to the new one?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] In essence, it has been reaffirmed by the Career Service--

MR. ECHOLS: I would say very little is at stake where a man is clearly in a field of work that does call for this, but if he has transferred to some other field, then it might be of considerable significance.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Isn't that the case you're getting into here today?

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

But I think a lot of these cases you have passed have been cases where the man has been overseas or under orders to go, or has just returned from overseas.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But surely it would seem encumbent upon the Head of the Career Service if there is any doubt to have them sign a new agreement.

MR. ECHOLS: I don't think we have gotten ourselves into a bind here at all.

MR. WARFIELD: One thing you could do, you could take those people that are in the System that have less than 15 years and circulate a new Service Agreement through their command channels. But I personally don't think you gain much by it.

MR. ECHOLS: I don't either.

MR. WARFIELD: It really comes up, Jim, when you sit down with your people and review their career -- 'where are you going now -- what lies ahead -- and your willingness, and our interest in you--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't know, I think those are two different things, Alan. I really believe that the cases in which we do not get a Service Agreement out of people who have had less than 15 years of service should be very rare indeed -- and I gather that perhaps in more than 50% of the cases we have processed that there has been very little execution of the new Service Agreement.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] 50% might be a good estimate.

25X1A9a MR. ECHOLS: That wasn't our intent--

[REDACTED] Are you sure most of those are people who have not had over 15 years? I would think most of them would have--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This is what I think is your point here -- many of these people have been overseas or have just come back, and certainly have been in a recent posture--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] 15 years and the five - those that have that, I don't see any point in it. There you're just causing problems that aren't necessary. But for those with under 15 years and five, I think they all ought to sign one.

**SECRET**



SECRET

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I could certainly do this - go through and make a study -- I'd have to review cases -- but I could come up with a figure of how many we would have come up--

MR. ECHOLS: If you're going to come up with numbers, you might as well compile a list of names. Shall we at least make a testing of this to see what our situation is?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, get more information. I just objected to applying it to a case today because it seemed to me a much more complex problem than was probably recognized.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, I can see we might decide, conceivably, to rectify this easy route that they may have taken in the processing of these things in some of the Career Services, and in an attempt to rectify it we might find some people who will say, "Not me -- that old agreement - I signed that eight [REDACTED] years ago -- I won't reaffirm my availability." Of course, they can be expunged from the System very easily.

I will proceed, then, with a new paragraph b. -- new concept -- and see if General Counsel thinks this is within a reasonable interpretation of the Regulation -- I'm not sure I won't even inquire (on a policy level), regardless of whether General Counsel thinks so.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Phil, as we now move ahead to new people - when they hit their 5th year surely all of those are signing new Service Agreements.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, [REDACTED] because there would not have been an old Application for Membership on record.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] So we're moving in the right direction now.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes. It would only be those for whom an old application was of record--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But that is a little different from what you said awhile ago -- you said there are some [REDACTED] for whom--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No -- maybe you took it that way, but I did not intend to imply--

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9a [REDACTED] For those with under 15 years there is either a new one or an old one in the file?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Oh well, then there is no problem.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That was why I asked if there was any difference between the new one and the old one. You do have one or the other.

MR. ECHOLS: Yes, one or the other. Does this dissolve the problem--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No, I still think we ought to study this--

MR. ECHOLS: See how many we have let through on old agreements. All right.

I do have another item here. I think I reported at the last meeting that the Executive Director is real anxious to get this first go-around over with. He wants to set a deadline and write a memo to each of the DD's

25X1A9a asking them to meet this deadline. [REDACTED] was going to give us a report as to when he thought they could complete their operation, but he is not here today. I've been stalling on this because I think we would prefer not to have the Executive Director do this, if it isn't necessary. If we can meet a 30 October deadline -- if I can assure Col. White of this, I'm sure he will just hold us to it but let it go without any [REDACTED] big stir. How close to the end are we? There

25X9A2 are [REDACTED] one in the "I" Service, one in "IC", two in "ID", 15 in "SJ" - what is that?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The JOT -- and they might remain in that until they are assigned to a Career Service.

MR. ECHOLS: Two in "SP", one in Security.

So it really depends on your Service, Jim -- and I'll check with Gerry and if he says they can do it by 30 October I'll just --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That is probably not as clean as it looks. OC, for example, shows it being clean -- but you still have cases churning up here, I assume.

SECRET

**SECRET**

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Oh yes.

MR. ECHOLS: Phil, can you process this number of cases  
by 30 October?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] No, sir.  
[REDACTED] We have to have decided on these cases? or  
merely reviewed the cases.

MR. ECHOLS: I think Col. White's real concern is to have the  
Career Services complete their job. And this Board and [REDACTED] the Retirement  
Staff will process them as fast as we can.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Because another segment of my work begins  
when I have to [REDACTED] (send) overseas and get the election of these people - meet  
that requirement before we put them into the System.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes, I would think it would be impossible,

25X1A9a really, for you (indicating [REDACTED]) to clean them up by the end of October.

25X1A9a And you (indicating [REDACTED]) must be down to the  
tough ones, I imagine.

MR. WARFIELD: What is the 2nd anniversary of the enactment  
of the Bill?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] 13 October.  
[REDACTED] I'm a little confused about what is meant by  
"the first go-around." Are these the people who were eligible as of the time  
of the enactment of the Act?

MR. ECHOLS: We are required to review the [REDACTED] records of  
all employees--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Eligibles and ineligibles. In other words, people  
keep joining the Agency, so where is the break-off--

MR. ECHOLS: Five years. We have no problem--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] As of a given date -- any date we pick -- we have  
considered everybody who had five years on that date -- as of this date we have  
completed everybody. I don't think that would be a problem. Sure, the next  
day there will be some more.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

MR. ECHOLS: Well, I'll make a complete report to Col.

White, giving him the deadline by which the Career Services believe they can complete their job -- and then I'll get an estimate from you, Phil, as to when you think you can complete your job, provided they complete their job --

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It doesn't look like we will be too far off that

25X9A2 [REDACTED] figure.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It looks like

25X9A2 [REDACTED]

MR. ECHOLS: Any other discussion? (No response.)

The meeting is adjourned.

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m. . . . .

**SECRET**